



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

Some years ago I was harangued by one of my former students—a flower recently ‘escaped from cultivation’, to use a botanical phrase—on the importance of Greek as an element in modern culture. Now that is a subject that always stirs me to rebellion, and prompts me to take the other side. I understand perfectly why Lord Lyttelton and Miss Swanwick finally turned against Greek; and when the printers once made me speak of the ‘indefensibility of classical studies’ instead of the ‘indefeasibility of classical studies’, I was chagrined at having missed so fine a theme. However, I am constitutionally averse to debate, and so submitted meekly to the rolling periods of the young professor, although I suspected that he was practising on me as Phaidros would fain have practised on Sokrates. But my thoughts wandered round the stake to which I was tethered. Bréal had recently published an article on ἀγορεύειν, now incorporated in his new book on Homer, and I wondered whether ‘harangue’ would ever lose the sense of public discourse, as ἀγορεύειν seems to have done. Odysseus, as Bréal urges, does not threaten to ‘harangue’ Eumaios (Od. 14, 192), and it is to be hoped that Penelope did not ‘harangue’ her maids (Od. 17, 505). Then, as my eyes rested on the fluent sermonizer, the Greek proverb δελφίνα νήχεσθαι διδάσκεις came up to my mind, and I meditated on the spheres of English and Greek metaphor in proverbs, the grace of the one, the homeliness of the other, and from that I passed on to the arithmetical problems of the Greek Anthology and thought it a pity that they had not found their way into our school-books. They are so much prettier than ours. It was but a step from that to the beauty of the Greek hydraulic toys. But by that time the voice had ceased, and Apollo saved me. It was after all a somewhat amusing experience to play the part of Anstey’s hero in ‘Vice Versa’. But it is an experience that does not bear frequent repetition, and while I have never replied to any of the ill-considered criticisms of my Pindar that have crossed my track from time to time, since my review of Dr. FENNELL’S *Olympian and Pythian Odes* (A. J. P. XIV 498 foll.), I am moved to make an exception in the case of Dr. HEADLAM, who, if not exactly a young man, is little more than half my age, and who has been amusing himself by reproducing what his countrymen call ‘class-room funniments’ about some of my notes on Pindar, in the course of which he has read me some lessons that I hardly need. See *Journal of Philology*, No. 60, p. 299.

P. 4, 285 the poet says of Damophilos whose cause he is pleading: οὐδὲ μακύνων τέλος οὐδέν. ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων βραχὺ μέτρον ἔχει. εὖ νυν ἔγνωκεν' θεραπείων δέ οἱ, οὐ δράστας ὀπαδεῖ. The passage has been variously interpreted. The sense that it yielded to me is: 'Damophilos is not one that postpones decisive action. The favorable season hath but a brief span. Damophilos knows IT full well. He follows IT close as an attendant (θεράπων), not as a drudge (δράστας)'. Fraccaroli, who knows Pindar better than Dr. HEADLAM does, and has made better use of my edition, renders the passage: 'Ben la (=l'occasione) conobbe e quale famigliar l'accompagna, e non ischiavo'. The scholiast and Mezger after him consider the subject of ὀπαδεῖ to be καιρός, not Damophilos. I do not agree with this interpretation, but it is not absurd; and so I indulged in a little note on the aspects of time to the Greek, the mutuality, so to speak, of Time and Man as illustrated by χρόνος, ἡμέρα, καιρός—a manner of supplement to O. 2, 11. Dr. HEADLAM merely quotes the scholiast to shew 'quam minima scientia scribantur scholia'. 'Quantula' is the way I learned the famous sentence of the Swedish Chancellor but no matter. This is the way in which Dr. HEADLAM treats my note.

Prof. Gildersleeve: "The Greeks conceive Time and man as companions (ὁ χρόνος σύνων, Soph.). If, as Hesiod says, Day is sometimes a step-mother, sometimes a mother to a man (O. et D. 825), so a man may be a son or a stepson to Time—an attendant (θεράπων), as Patroklos was on Achilles, or a mere drudge. A θεράπων is one who has rights, who can avail himself of an opportunity without servility."

But χρόνος is a very different thing from καιρός: a man was not said in Greek ὀπαδεῖν χρόνον; nor in the text is there anything whatever about either son or stepson.

This too is a good example to illustrate what I have been urging lately, that until we are familiar with Greek *ideas*, we shall never be able to read Aeschylus or Pindar or Greek literature generally with the right intelligence. καιρός is the *proper point* in time or place, etc., etc., etc., etc.

Now if Dr. HEADLAM had pondered the words he quoted, if he had observed that I use the word *opportunity*, if he had been at the pains to consult the commentators, he would have found that we were both in accord with Heyne, and that there is nothing new in his interpretation. Says Heyne: Capit occasiones opportunas consiliis, non servili modo ex iis pendet ut ex herili nutu. The lecture on the difference between χρόνος and καιρός is wasted. I have not needed it any time these sixty years, and assuredly I did not need it in 1885 or any of the citations Dr. HEADLAM has rattled, to use Wilamowitz's charming expression (A. J. P. XXIV 234). In Anglo-Saxon we use 'time' for both χρόνος and καιρός, and Dr. HEADLAM himself in the course of his criticism translates καιρός 'time'. To 'serve time' illustrates the one, 'to be a time-server' illustrates the other. In idiomatic English we have no word for θεραπείων, and that is what I tried to bring out, for Mezger's 'freund' is unsatisfactory.

The *θεράπων* is after all subordinate. Damophilos is no mere 'opportunist' as Dr. HEADLAM correctly explains, for I have no quarrel with his exegesis. In 1885 'opportunist' was not the common word that it is now or I might have used it. In 1885 Mr. Ingalls had not written his much quoted sonnet on 'Opportunity'. If he had, I should not have cited it. But in 1885 I wrote on P. 1, 48: *ἡνίκα : ὅτε :: καιρός : χρόνος*. This very Fourth Pythian has for its burden *χρόνος* as the Ninth has for its *leitmotif* *καιρός* (A. J. P. XXV 483). To be sure, I might have cited Mrs. Barbauld's famous poem for the Greek conception of *χρόνος*, 'Life, we've been long together', and for *καιρός* Tennyson's 'who knew the seasons, when to take occasion by the hand' or else '<who> grasps the skirts of happy chance', but I have my own views as to the proper range of illustrative quotation, and do not repent me of the brevity of my commentary on Pindar, although a good English friend of mine once told me with British bluntness that my notes were not so much notes as notes for notes. Against careless and captious readers like Dr. HEADLAM one is never safe.

---

P. 2, 82: *ἀγὰν διαπλέκει* is a very difficult passage. If, as has been suggested, the MS *ἀγαν* is a gloss on *πάγχν*, the conjectural genius has full sway, but is it credible that *πάγχν* should need a gloss? Schroeder cites my explanation without comment. Dr. HEADLAM says:

I will only say that whether or not it was possible in Greek *to weave a bend*, the expression would have conveyed nothing here to a Greek mind. Greek serpents did not fawn; nor did the Greek dog behave according to the pronouncement of Prof. Gildersleeve: '*ἀγή*, 'bend', is not the doubling of the fox but the peculiar fawning way in which the dog makes an arc of himself'. I should have said that it was more peculiar to the cat:—but probably this dog is of the same breed as that which certain critics of Agam. 1228 have described as *stretching out a smiling ear*.

Now, if Dr. HEADLAM had ever played with a dog, he would have known what I meant. There is no reference to the arched back of the dog, 'le chien', as a French observer has it, 'pris en faute que l'on voit s'enfuir, l'oreille basse, *le dos arqué*, la queue en ventre'. My reference is to the arc of a circle that the dog makes of himself in his wheedling approach to his master, what the observer already quoted, calls the 'bondissement latéral'. It is this curl, this wriggle, that seems to be meant by *ἀγὰν διαπλέκει*. It is not necessary to insist on the 'braiding', 'plaiting' sense of *διαπλέκει* here any more than in the other passages cited. The fawning dog wriggles his way through as the wolf makes a circuit and heads off his foes, *λύκοιο δίκαν ὑποθείσομαι*. But this reminds me of another railing accusation brought against my interpretation of this comparison in *Hermathena*, 1904, p. 177,

because I do not translate ἵπο- by 'crossing', as if the word I use in explaining the passage, 'circumvent', did not involve crossing.

---

A friend of mine, who has made a close study of dogs for many years, says: 'I should think that any one, whom a dog has deigned to notice, would have in turn noticed the felicity of your interpretation of ἀγὰν διαπλέκει', and confirmation has come to me since from various sources. But what does Dr. HEADLAM propose to do with the passage?

'The Greek conception', he continues, 'was that *Treachery* by *fawning* lures into the *Net of Harm*: δολόμητιν δ' ἀπάταν θεοῦ τίς ἀνὴρ θνατὸς ἀλύξει; φιλόφρων γὰρ σαίνουσα τὸ πρῶτον παράγει βροτὸν εἰς ἄρκνας ἄτας, Aesch. Pers. 94. The obvious ἄταν Heyne did indeed conjecture; yet hardly a single critic has approved it; Hermann, who had given his approval once, withdrew it afterwards in favour of this same misguided ἀγὰν'.

Surely, Hermann's withdrawal might have given Dr. HEADLAM pause. To quote his own words, à propos of καιρός and χρόνος, 'until we are familiar with Greek *ideas* we shall never be able to read Aeschylus or Pindar or Greek literature generally with the right intelligence'. In this sphere and in this passage ἄτη means much more than 'harm' as καιρός means much more than χρόνος. Atέ is one of the untranslatables and Shakespeare uses the word in the Greek form over and over. After Homer Atέ becomes a heaven-sent, or if you choose, a hell-sent Goddess of Mischief, and in the Aeschylean passage we have to do with a δολόμητις ἀπάτη θ ε ο ὦ, not with human treachery or canine wheedling. It is rather strange that the critic who found so much fault with me for omitting entirely δαιμονία in my paraphrase of O. 9, 118<sup>1</sup> (l. c., p. 305) should have overlooked the θεοῦ in his rendering of the passage from the Persae, for it is on θεοῦ 'that the strongest stress is thrown'. To those who are lured into the Net of Atέ, God 'sends a strong delusion that they should believe a lie'. But τίς ἀνὴρ θνατὸς ἀλύξει; when it comes to interpreting Pindar and Aeschylus. That δαίμων in post-Homeric theology means 'genius'—a discovery which Dr. HEADLAM springs upon the world—will be no news to the Aeschylean or Pindaric scholar or any other scholar. See Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. The application to O. 9 is another matter.

---

I hold no brief for the veterans (A. J. P. XXV 108), and abandon all old men, myself included, to the tender mercies of Rudyard

<sup>1</sup> An amazing misstatement only to be paralleled by Herr STOLZ's false witness (A. J. P. XXII 350), for which Herr STOLZ has not had the grace to apologize. My 'paraphrase' of O. 9 runs thus (p. 202): 'The narrative of his successes closes the poem with a recognition of the *divine decree* (δαιμονία v. 118 q. v.) that made him quick of hand, ready of limb, valorous of eye'.

Kipling, whose savage indictment of *The Old Men* I keep ever before me on my study table. We are all old enough to know better. Burges was sixty-two in 1848 when he remarked on Hermann's emendation, Aesch. Ag. 160: οὐ λελέξεται, that the great German scholar had neglected to show that λελέξεται is used as a future passive, as if that were not the chief use of the fut. perf. 'middle', as if Plato had not written Rpb. 457 A: κάλλιστα γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ λέγεται καὶ λελέξεται. Paley was sixty-two in 1878 when he woke up to the narrow range of the fut. participle (J. of Phil. 8, p. 79) to my great amusement and wonderment at his ὀφθαλμία. Perhaps by the time Dr. HEADLAM is sixty-two he will wake up to this elementary fact. In his discussion of Aeschyl. Ag. 1277 (l. c. 290), he says: 'μένει με κοπεῖσαν ὅτ κοπεῖση could not mean "awaits me, about to be beheaded", κοφθησομένην', as if the fut. participle were a normal construction, to say nothing of the form κοφθησομένην, which, so far as I see, lacks warrant. But all this is a weariness, and I am ashamed to waste the scant pages of *Brief Mention* in replies to criticisms, a profitless exercise at any rate, from which I dissuade all over whom I have any influence. So I will not stop to shew that there are in my judgment four good reasons for rejecting Dr. HEADLAM's interpretation of O. 6, 74: μῶμος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέμαται φθονεόντων κτέ. which he renders 'Cavil of the envious hangs beyond all others over those on whom'.

---

The blunders, mainly self-detected, of my Pindar, have cost me many sleepless nights, but Dr. HEADLAM's sneering comment will not disturb the light slumbers of my late afternoon, and I hope that he too will sleep *sur les deux oreilles* on his impossible future participle. Or, if he belongs to the order of mind that is consoled by other people's mistakes—I do not—he may take comfort from the fact that a great scholar and genius, to whom even he would look up, once wrote in a heedless moment ἀπονίσαι for ἀπονίσαι; and in the last few days I have stumbled upon a number of 'howlers'—to use the academic slang of the other side—that make one hold one's breath; for the sinners are scholars who are to be held in the highest esteem. One academic eminence puts six hundred years between Thukydides and Polybios; a great Homeric authority cites αἰσθάνομαι as a specimen of the Homeric 'middle of feeling' though αἰσθάνομαι does not occur in Homer; and a most deserving commentator on Aristophanes, cites as a parallel to Pindar P. 6, 36: βόασε παῖδα ὄν, the familiar passage from Lys. I, 11: τὸ παιδίον ἐβόα in which τὸ παιδίον is subject (S. C. G. §205). But the word 'subject' reminds me of another specimen of oscitancy, and here again we have to deal with a noted commentator on Aristophanes, who tells us R. 1367: τὸ γὰρ βάρος τὸ βασανιεῖ τῶν ῥημάτων that βάρος is subject and νό object, as unnecessary a piece of information as Dr. HEADLAM's sermon on the difference between χρόνος and καιρός.

It is fourteen years since DRERUP, a favorite pupil of Lipsius, took up the task of editing ISOKRATES, which Bürmann had abandoned. He had the advantage of training in the school of an eminent master in the domain of Attic oratory: he succeeded to the studies and the apparatus of Bürmann and Keil (A. J. P. VI 107), and he had the privilege of access to the Index Isocrateus of Baiter, then in MS, now edited by Preuss, whose name it bears (A. J. P. XXVI 237). The fruit of this long and ample preparation, lies before us in the first volume of DRERUP's *Isokrates* (Leipzig, Dieterich) and will doubtless receive respectful consideration, more respectful, it is to be hoped, than DRERUP accords to some of his predecessors. The series of DRERUP's Isokratean studies was opened with a dissertation on the authority of the codices of Isokrates, followed up by various papers on the text of Isokrates in which he has recorded the results of his researches in the libraries of England, France, Italy and Austria. The first chapter of the Praefatio gives a minute description of the papyri and codices of Isokrates; the second deals with the interrelation of the codices; the third treats of the excellence of the Urbinas, of the archetype, of the papyri, of the *testimonia veterum*. In the fourth he discusses the dates and the genuineness of the various orations of Isokrates, and in the fifth he describes and characterizes the previous editions of the orator, and unfolds the method pursued in the present work. There is to be a sixth chapter, which will have to do with the life of Isokrates, the arguments of the orations and the scholia. But this chapter is reserved for publication with the second half, which is to be brought in the current year (1907).

---

After all the labor bestowed on the text of an orator, whose importance is out of all proportion to his popularity; after all this elaborate preparation for the annotation of so many neglected orations, one learns with regret that Professor DRERUP declines the task, and has determined to devote himself to the text of Demosthenes to which he has already made important contributions, as he does not fail to remind us. Now Demosthenes will never lack students, even if they are not so well equipped as Professor DRERUP. But for Isokrates there are few who share the enthusiasm of Hieronymus Wolf, cited by DRERUP (p. CLXVII): 'Quae mihi res (Euagorae laudatio) tantam Isocratis admirationem movit ut ex eo tempore vix ullum sive Latinum sive Graecum scriptorem illi anteponeam'. Discourse as much as you choose about the influence of Isokrates on oratorical art, about the importance of his educational programme, and the loftiness of his Pan-Hellenism, he is a sheer weariness to the average modern, whether in translation or in the original; and those who have to study him are grateful to Pöhlmann (A. J. P.

XVI 528) for extracting from his text something besides unimpeachable moral lessons, patriotic commonplaces and self-satisfied reflexions on the wonderful work of his life. 'Compel them to come in' is the motto of the few who make a cult of Isokrates, and the droll book of Kyprianos gives expression to a feeling that the novice in Isokrates is very apt to entertain. The fact that no annotated edition of all Isokrates has appeared since the time of Coraïs, just a hundred years ago, speaks volumes for the practical estimation in which he is held, and sharpens the regret that has already been expressed.

---

For my own part, in spite of sundry flippant utterances, I have long valued Isokrates as a touchstone for the appreciation of what may be called the physical charm of the Greek language, and if I am ever tempted to underrate him otherwise, I take the blame to myself. For one thing, Isokrates is associated with the memory of my early student years while at Berlin (1850-51), when for the first time I was brought face to face with such men as Boeckh and Lachmann and Bekker. It was a great thing for an American boy to see scholars in the flesh. Boeckh I worshipped, ignorantly, no doubt. Lachmann *tantum vidi*, but Bekker, Immanuel Bekker, was a great name even to an untaught American youth, and I hastened to buy a copy of the Berlin edition of the *Oratores Attici*, and to inscribe myself for his lectures on Isokrates. To my amazement I found myself in the smallest auditorium of the university, which, small as it was, offered ample accommodation for the handful of students that shared my venture. At the appointed hour the great man came in scowling, plunged his face into his notes, and began to read with scant comment a lot of *variae lectiones*. I was quite unprepared for that sort of lecture, and after a few times fell out, as I believe the rest did also, to the joy of the old scholar, who was thus liberated from his task. In 1860 I was in Germany again and related my experience to Leopold Schmidt, the noted Pindaric scholar, who told me that he and several of his friends bound themselves by an oath to make Bekker lecture, and that when the master found that he could not shake off his unwelcome auditors, he surrendered at discretion and opened to his captors the treasures of his wonderful knowledge. Never, said Schmidt, have I derived so much from any of my teachers. Even the most bitter foes of Germans and German scholarship have done homage to Bekker, and as I take up my well-worn *Oratores Attici*, and look at the *malim's* in the notes, I realize how much he was in advance of his times. No wonder, then, I am even more unpleasantly affected by DRERUP's condescension upon Bekker than I was by his sneering remark about Goodwin (A. J. P. XXIII 109). No wonder that I am somewhat resentful



when I read: 'Bekkerum non ex subtili oratoris cognitione sed ex libro antiquissimo ne diligenter quidem excusso, in quem fausta fortuna ductus inciderat, recensionem tumultuariam instituisse cognoscitur; ex ingenio suo ad oratorem emendandum perpauca attulit.' It is true that we have learned to read more closely; it is true that, thanks largely to excellent indices and to statistical investigations, we can pronounce more confidently as to the chances of this reading and that, but it is hard for an oldster to see a DRERUP pass on to a Bekker the buffet that Bekker dealt to a Villoison. One of the counts in the cruel indictment brought against HOUSMAN (A. J. P. XXVII 487) by WÖRPEL (N. P. Rundschau, 1906, S. 533) is 'eine hart an Abgunst streifende Taktlosigkeit hochverdienten Gelehrten gegenüber'. It is a count on which others besides HOUSMAN can hardly be acquitted. But *Brief Mention* is not the place for the discussion of DRERUP's constitution of the text of Isokrates. It follows the Urbinas closely and where there is a deviation, the editor shows a careful study of the usage of the orator. But to this conservatism there is a very disagreeable contrast in the revolutionary change he has made in the order of the orations. With characteristic cocksureness DRERUP has abandoned the customary arrangement for an order based on the rhetorical subdivisions. The λόγοι δικανικοί are put first, then the ἐγκώμια and παραινέσεις, to be followed by the λόγοι συμβουλευτικοί and the letters. No matter what the theoretical justification of such an arrangement may be (comp. A. J. P. VI 108), it is a serious practical mistake, and as Preuss has not accommodated his index to Drerup's views, the student will feel indignant at the enhanced difficulty of reference. To be sure, Preuss has discarded the old familiar numbers, but the abandonment of the sequence means a decided retardation in the use of DRERUP's edition. All such changes are vexatious, as when Krüger, in numbering the books of Herodotos, follows the order of the Greek alphabet to the neglect of the ἐπίσημον for 6, as Poppe has done in his small edition of Thukydides. Nor am I disposed to forgive Voemel for abandoning the traditional numbering of Demosthenes' orations after he passes 34. A change heartily welcomed was Nauck's introduction of the alphabetical order of the plays of Euripides; for a chronological order, if it is to be of real use, must be certain; and when Mr. MURRAY's *Euripides* came out I expressed my regret that he had not seen fit to follow Nauck (A. J. P. XXIII 110), but a rearrangement of Demosthenes so that XVIII, XIX, XX, LIV should not carry one at once to the spot would be a nuisance.

---

In A. J. P. XXII 232 I remarked: 'The only authority cited for 'neck and crop' (A. J. P. XIV 258) by the Century Dictionary <s. v. 'crop'> is my close contemporary, George Augustus

Sala, and the Oxford Dictionary bids us wait for NECK which I shall never live to see.' But I have lived to see it. Only I am sorry to find that the earliest authority given is 1825, and no explanation is vouchsafed. 'Crop', 'crap', means 'scruff of the neck', says the English Dialect Dictionary, and this may be accepted as the proper meaning here.

---

G. L.: Students of Plautus will be much interested in Professor RADFORD's elaborate paper on "*Plautine Synizesis*" (Am. Phil. Trans. XXXVI, pp. 158-210). The term synizesis has been used very loosely by editors and critics and its relation to the Iambic Law has been much disputed. Professor RADFORD shows that the phenomena of synizesis in Early Latin are distinctly Roman, while in the Classical Poets, as Vergil, they are Greek. In the latter the usage "assumes the weakening of a *medial* syllable" in a polysyllable like *alveo*, whereas in the former it "is chiefly connected with the weakening of an *initial* syllable in words beginning with an iambus", as *(e)os*, *(e)amus*, *t(u)am rem* (but always *exeamus*, *aureo* without such weakening). It occurs in connection with the short vowels e, i and u, which have not degenerated into consonants but are true vowels "with slurred or faded tones".

According to this an extensive list of words which are usually classed under the Iambic Law must be removed; for "an iambic sequence of syllables if initial, i. e. if forming a single word or word-beginning, has the value of a single long, in case the former of the two syllables contains the half-vowel u or i, or the similarly pronounced e, in hiatus".

This synizesis does not appear in verse closes for various reasons; it occurs "most frequently in proclitic and enclitic words like possessive pronouns or the substantive verb, which usually have little appreciable accent of their own; but it is also freely admitted in words which possess the ordinary intensity of tone", when they are subordinated to words of greater force and weight.

In the course of the discussion, which is very detailed, Professor Radford treats a number of matters more or less intimately connected with the immediate subject, such as the scansion of *nempe* and similar words in which he justly takes issue with Skutsch; the position of the possessive pronoun, the metrical treatment of *rem*, *gnatum* and so forth. In all these cases his remarks are valuable and acute. He betrays however in some places a lack of fixity of opinion which is to be deprecated. Thus at the beginning of the paper, he discusses the divergent views of the ancient *metrici* who divided syllables into long and short only and the *rhythmici* or *musici* who recognized a *syllabam longa longiorem* and *brevi brevior*. He bases his discussion on the theories of the latter school. On page 198, he admits that he could have arrived at the same results in entire dependence upon the teach-

ings of the metrici and that the early part of his paper is not absolutely necessary. On page 174, he advances and retracts a view as to the treatment of *nescio quis* in the same paragraph. On page 189, he admits in a footnote that the view advocated in the text may be wrong. In some places also he confuses certain things that are not similar. Thus on page 182, he reckons *uoluptas* as a word that suffers synizesis like *eorundem*. On the same page he regards *quoii* as an iambus. On page 164, he includes *laudarier* and *laudari* as doublets in the same list as *periculum* and *periclum*. But these small matters do not affect the valuable treatment of the whole subject. I must, however, protest against the perverse use of *arsis* instead of *thesis* for accented syllable, which is now abandoned by all American and most English handbooks, as well as in recent discussions of English metric.

---

M. W.: Although according to Professor Scripture the division of words into syllables and of verse into feet on present principles is nonsense, and must give way to a psychological 'centroid' theory, most of us profane still continue to speak of syllables and feet, and the practical application of the 'centroid' theory to ancient verse is reserved for the grammar of the future. THULIN in his recent treatise on *Italische Sakrale Poesie und Prosa* (Berlin Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1906) deals largely with syllables and cola, assonance and rhyme. Certain parts of the Etruscan Agram inscription, which he regards as ritualistic, as well as the prayers in the Iguvinian tables, he proves to be metrical. The greater part of his treatise is devoted to the Saturnian and to the Carmina preserved in Cato, Macrobius and Livy. In his discussion of the Saturnian he takes issue with Leo on many points, not according to quantity the supreme rôle, and yet laying less weight upon accent than has been customary of late. Coincidence of accent and ictus he recognizes as invariable in the second part of the first colon. This first colon to use the words of the writer arises "aus einem dreiwortigen Kolon, das erst allmählich in einen quantitierenden umgewandelt worden ist, und noch die Spuren seiner ursprünglichen Natur aufweist". Confirmatory evidence for this view is found in the Oscan and Umbrian. The treatment of the Carmina and the *Haruspicum verba*, in which he finds parallelism, symmetry and rhythmical elements associated with alliteration, is especially interesting.

---

M. W.: S. EITREM, *Observations on the Colax of Menander and the Eunuch of Terence* (Christiania, 1906, pp. 28). The author discusses the considerable fragment of Menander's Colax published in the third volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, beginning

with the best preserved part containing the description of the parasite. Following Ribbeck in part, he illustrates the leading characteristics of the parasite, with an array of passages, skilfully grouped, drawn from many Greek and Latin writers. For some of the doubtful lines in the Menander fragment he suggests emendations. He then discusses briefly the contamination in the Eunuchus of Terence, attempting to show how far Terence has followed Menander's Eunuch, how far his Colax, and to what extent has been independent, as in the character of Antipho. Terence's eagerness to condense his Greek original, he thinks, has sometimes lead him into obscurity and slight inconsistencies. In the nature of the case, the results reached are not conclusive. Hasten the day, when the discovery of a completed original of one of Terence's plays may put an end to mere hypothesis.

---

W. P. M.: *Tennysons Sprache und Stil*, by Dr. ROMAN DYBOSKI, is a new volume (1907) of the Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie. It devotes 544 pages to an elaborate classification of the poet's peculiarities of syntax, style and language. It is a work of enormous industry and wide learning, and its orderly collections of examples will be of great use and convenience to future editors. One little slip may be of interest if only because it suggests some weird possibilities in our long-range views of the classics. The expression, "a schoolboys' barring out", is explained as meaning "breaking out of bar". The author remarks that the meaning of the verb is reversed by the addition of the adverb, and offers an illustration from the Saemundar Edda. The volume has its lesson, too, for the reckless tribe of hunters after literary parallels. The expression "the wonder of the hilt" (*die wunderschön gearbeitete Hilze*) is compared with a passage of 'M. Chuzzlewit', "looking far into the deep wonder of her bright dark eyes". And the 'Latinism' in "last night, their mask was *patent*" is illustrated by another passage of Dickens, "a *patent* upright grand pianoforte". "We are so apt to see parallels when we are well acquainted with but one of the lines—or with neither".